The Christian East

A QUARTERLY REVIEW DEVOTED TO THE STUDY OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES

EDITED BY THE
REV. CANON J. A. DOUGLAS, B.D., Ph.D.,
AND THE REV. R. M. FRENCH, M.A.

WINTER, 1931-2.
Vol. XII. No. 4. 1s. 6d.

PUBLISHED FOR
THE ANGLICAN & EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCN.
BY
THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.

CONTENTS.

THE DEATH OF HIS BEATITUDE DAMIANOS, PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM 113

LINKS OF FRIENDSHIP. By THEODORA EYTON-JONES 115

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE 117

OUR BOOKSHELF 142

THE GREEN QUARTERLY

is the Church Illustrated Magazine. For 1/- a quarter you obtain 68 pages of articles and illustrations on Church and general topics.

The SPRING number contains articles on the Problems of the Church in the villages, on Religion and Education (by the headmaster of a public school), on Romsey Abbey, a quarterly Chronicle by an Anglo-Catholic, a portrait of the late Bishop Gore, reviews of books, of the stage, etc., etc. THE GREEN QUARTERLY keeps you in intelligent touch with all questions of the day of interest to Churchmen.

Why not subscribe 4/6 a year, post free, or order through bookseller?

PHILIP ALLAN & CO. LTD.
QUALITY HOUSE, 69 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

The Christian East

THE DEATH OF HIS BEATITUDE DAMIANOS, PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM.

THE sudden end to the life, which had come to the last stage and then halted, brought a shock to many who had known the Patriarch Damianos as a generous friend.

The tidings that life was ebbing fast came first to the Russian nuns worshipping under the stars and the cypresses outside the little "Galilee" Church in the Patriarch's garden.

"Would the priest officiating bring the Holy Sacrament with all possible speed."

With such haste as consorted with reverence, Fr. Seraphim concluded the Liturgy, and as the dawn brightened over the rampart of Transjordan and lighted up the Judean desert, the Blessed Sacrament was brought to the dying Patriarch's room.

By then he had become unconscious, and at first it was feared that it might prove impossible to give him his viaticum. But it seemed as if the Presence made Itself known to him, and he suddenly opened his eyes and understood, and received of "the heavenly and life-giving Mystery."

Five hours later his soul passed away.

Two Russian priests were at hand to prepare the body for burial, and they vested it in white silk sakkos and golden jewelled mitre, laying within the folded arms the silver-bound Book of the Gospels and the silver Cross of benediction, disposing it in a sitting posture to receive the last homage of the Faithful.

The tolling of the great bell of the Holy Sepulchre helped to spread the news through the Holy City, and soon a stream of Orthodox began to arrive from near and far; amongst the first being the Russian Archbishop, who mourned the loss of a personal friendship to which is largely due the present kindly relations between Greek and Russian clergy.

But not only the great and the Church folk, also humble Moslem neighbours from the village of Tur came in sorrow. "He was kind to us when we were children and, when all our food was taken during the War, he fed us and kept us from starving."

After a short service at which all the clergy of the Patriarchate attended the body was taken to the beautiful little old Church of

SS. Constantine and Helena, which looks down on the Holy Sepulchre and Calvary.

All night long Russian nuns watched, and at the first glimmer of dawn the office of Matins was sung by the clergy of the Patriarchate and the Holy Liturgy celebrated. Many came then and all through the morning to kiss the hand of the dead Patriarch.

The burial service in the afternoon was attended by representatives of all the religious bodies, Latin, Armenian, Anglican, Coptic, Syrian, Moslem and Jewish, of the government and consulate, and an enormous crowd which could not force an entrance into the tiny church.

The exigencies of the occasion—the heat within and the tumult without—made it advisable to shorten the rite at the time to a few prayers and psalms, the Gospel, and a panegyric delivered by Father Kyriakos, Hegoumen of the Convent of S. Abram. (The greater part of the long and beautiful rite was sung after the interment.)

At 4 p.m. the procession headed by the titular Archbishops, vested in black mandyases embroidered with silver crosses, started for the cemetery on Mount Zion, the body of the Patriarch still seated erect on his throne as if to give a last blessing to the people of the Holy City.

Very slowly it wound its way past " the Tower of David " through the Armenian Quarter, and at the entrance to the Armenian Cathedral it halted to receive from a band of Armenian clergy and people a dignified tribute of Christian love and respect in the form of a short Armenian requiem.

It was 5 p.m. when we reached the holy spot where Our Lord gave us the Eucharist, where the Holy Spirit descended to fill the Church, and where the Blessed Mother fell asleep. With the thought of these divine pledges of the final transfiguration of our frail humanity, we commended to God's boundless love the soul of Damianos, our late Patriarch.

" For Thou art a good God and lovest mankind . . . and Thy word is true."

And we ask the prayers of all our Anglican brethren for him, and, during these next few months, for those who will elect his successor. Pray for the peace of Jerusalem ; and still more pray for the casting-out from our midst of the atheistic mind which doubts our power to change and that dry bones can live again. Pray that the Orthodox Church may live in the spirit of her glorious heritage of doctrine and worship, that the Anglican Church may be enabled humbly and penitently to help her in her time of poverty and of political upheaval.

LINKS OF FRIENDSHIP

By Theodora Eyton-Jones.

I arrived in Jerusalem on April 14th, 1930, and after the official calls had been paid on the High Commissioner, Bishop and others, went out on my promised visit to the Archbishop of the Jordan at the Greek Convent of the Basilica of the Nativity at Bethlehem. A wing had been set aside for my use, books and beautiful flowers had been prepared, and two Russian women servants were in attendance.

The courtesy, kindness and attention received from the saintly Archbishop, as well as the whole community, was beyond description wonderful.

The Archbishop arranged a seat for me near his Throne for the great Holy Week services in the Basilica of the Nativity. Perhaps the Service of the Burial of the Dead was the most impressive.

It was an unforgettable scene. The church was crowded with worshippers. The glistening splendour of the lamps sparkled down on the upturned and reverent faces of the devout and earnest Bethlehem women, dressed in their beautifully embroidered gowns, and long flowing white veils over their tall head-dresses. The screen formed a sea of golden glory in which thousands of candles scintillated.

Voices of many priests chanted and read the prayers. Then the figure of Jesus was taken down and buried in a great crate of flowers, amidst many rites. The Archbishop took my hand and led me down the steps of the Holy Grotto of the Birth of our Lord.

Worshippers holding their candles followed and knelt fervently to kiss the Star of Bethlehem and the walled-in stone where the manger is said actually to have been. Up the staircase the stately procession followed. Hundreds of eyes watched and many stretched out their hands to take a flower and to kiss the Archbishop's hand after his blessing. Some took mine and kissed them too, making the sign of the Cross on their foreheads.

The presence of a woman in the procession of Archbishop and priests was something they had never seen before, but they never questioned it.

When Holy Week, with its famous ceremonies of "the washing of the feet" in the Parvis of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Holy Fire, was over, the Archbishop of the Jordan arranged a visit to His Beatitude Damianos, the late Patriarch of Jerusalem, then a wonderful old man of 87.

On our arrival at his summer residence in the Mount of Olives

there was a gasp of joyous recognition from the servant he had brought with him to Fulham Palace on their historic visit to England.

We were escorted immediately to His Beatitude. His mind was as alert as ever and his kind eyes kindled with pleasure. Stretching out his unparalysed hand, and remembering my Christian name, he said, "Theodora, we have prayed for you to come and see us, we give you a welcome." Then he asked most earnestly after the Bishop of London, recalling the happy time he had spent there, and stated the warmth of the feeling of the Greek to the Anglican Church.

On being told by the Archbishop of the part in the procession in church which he had given me, the Patriarch smiled and said he wished to confer upon me the decoration of "Commander of the Holy Sepulchre." It is a beautiful golden Cross with a crown. Inside is a little piece of the wood of the real Cross.

The Archbishop bade me good-bye with the words, "We may meet again in England. You have been her Church's trust to us, and we have taken care of you as a sister. You have been called the 'Princess of Bethlehem.' We have never entertained a woman in the same way before. At last the longed-for invitation to Lambeth has come. Pray for us that we may be guided in that great Conference." So closed three wonderful and amazing weeks.

The second ecclesiastical visit was at Tanta in Egypt to the Archbishop of Hermopolis. He came to Cairo to fetch me from General and Mrs. Logan, with whom I was staying.

The Synod was sitting, and the Archbishop presented me to his All-Holiness Meletios, Patriarch of Alexandria. I bore a letter to him from the Archbishop of Germanos. He graciously issued an invitation that I should be his guest in Alexandria. Tanta is a cathedral town and the diocese stretches from Cairo to Alexandria.

Again a great welcome had been arranged. Schools and persons of interest were visited. The Archbishop of Hermopolis, who had been a candidate for the Patriarchate, is a saintly man and is beloved of all young people. He is a great scholar and thinker.

I left Alexandria on May 27th with a deep gratitude for so many kindnesses received in Egypt and with a growing sense of the links of friendship being forged.

On June 11th, the British Ambassador at Constantinople, Sir George Clerk, arranged a meeting with the Œcumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. He showed a great interest in the ecclesiastical visits I had paid, and the decoration bestowed by the Patriarch of Jerusalem. He gave me the letter to read received from the Archbishop of Canterbury for the Lambeth Conference, and spoke with deep appreciation and gratitude of the support and friendliness that the Eastern Churches had received, both from

the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London. He asked me to convey to them many kind messages.

On leaving, he gave me a large signed photograph of himself and a letter of introduction to the Archbishop of Athens, the Primate of Greece. The gracious personality and compelling charm of the Patriarch of Constantinople was but in keeping with the courtesies received throughout the whole wonderful journey.

On June 14th I was driven from the Legation at Athens for the final visit to the Archbishop of Athens, Primate of Greece. He is a scholarly man and was at one time Head of the Theological College at Jerusalem.

He spoke of the coming conference on Mount Athos and the earnest desire that all would go well in the Church's desire towards re-union at Lambeth.

It is interesting to remember that the Metropolitan of Athens, addressing an English Pilgrimage on June 18th, 1925, uttered these memorable words :—

"You will find it (our Church) such as it was when Theodore of Tarsus came to England as Archbishop of her Church. Theodore renewed the first ties of the Christian East with the English Church, because undoubtedly, the first missionaries in Britain came from Greek Asia Minor. We can see this from the diversities in Christian custom, which the missionaries who came from Rome later found in England."

It is in deep and heartfelt gratitude I write this tribute to the Eastern Churches, in my endeavour to portray what so few people know of their attitude towards Unity and Concord.

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE.

THE ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX CONJOINT COMMISSION—THE BULGARIAN "SCHISM"—THE FORTHCOMING PRO-SYNOD—THE TROUBLES IN CYPRUS.

THE salient event for us in recent months has necessarily been the first session of the Orthodox-Anglican Conjoint Commission which was held at Lambeth Palace from October 14 to October 20.

The personnel of the Orthodox side of the Commission was not appointed, as has been mistakenly inferred, by the Œcumenical Patriarch, but by the authorities of each of the autokephalous churches on His All-Holiness' invitation.

Like the Delegation which visited London in 1925 for the Anglican Commemoration of the 16th Centenary of the Great Council of Nikæa and like the Delegation which paid a ceremonial visit to the Lambeth Conference of last year, the Orthodox side of the Commission is officially representative of all the autokephalous Orthodox Churches—the Russian Patriarchate which was repre-

sented in 1925 and the Bulgarian Church which was unrepresented in 1925 alone being excepted.

In his speech of welcome to the Orthodox Delegates at the commencement of the session, the Archbishop of Canterbury was at pains to say how greatly he regretted that in spite of his request, the Œcumenical Patriarch had found himself unable to secure the presence of a Russian delegate or to invite the Bulgarian Church to appoint one.

The procedure for the appointment of the Conjoint Commission proposed by the Orthodox Delegation to the Lambeth Conference was that the Œcumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Canterbury should arrange respectively for the appointment of its Orthodox and Anglican personnel and of necessity his Grace could do no more than intimate to his All-Holiness that he would be profoundly distressed if Russian and Bulgarian delegates could not be secured.

That the Œcumenical Patriarch could not conform to the desire of his Grace was due on the one hand to the fact that the Bulgarian Church being in "schism" from the Œcumenical Patriarchate, he felt unable to communicate with its authorities. On the other hand, while owing to the persecution of the Russian Church no delegate could come from Russia, his All-Holiness has no relations with the Karlovci Synod of Russian Bishops in Exile over which the Metropolitan Antony presides and, since the Metropolitan Evlogie is now an Exarch of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, the Russian congregations which he governs, could not rightly be given separate and independent representation on the Commission.

The absence of Russian and Bulgarian delegates from the Commission was, therefore, inevitable and is easily understandable. But it is desirable both that the reason for that absence should be understood and that it should be known that if it had been in his power, his Grace would have secured the representation of those important Orthodox autokephalous Churches.

It may be said almost exclusively that even when a heresy has become the battle flag of schism, most schisms have had their roots in national, class or economic controversies. At any rate that is the case of the Greek-Bulgarian Schism. The Bulgarian Church is not accused of doctrinal heresy by the Greeks. The cause of its schism with Constantinople was the erection of a Bulgarian Exarchate and of Bulgarian dioceses in 1870 within the admitted jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Patriarchate. In plain English, acting under the incitement of Panslavist agents, the Bulgarian Church then advanced the theory of " phyletism," and acted on its

principle that wherever the nationals of an autokephalous Church may be, they have a right to be under the jurisdiction of their own Church and not under that of the Church within whose confines they are living. That "phyletism" strikes at the root of Œcumenical principle is unquestionable. Viewed abstractedly, therefore, the intrusion of the Bulgarian Exarchate into the territorial jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Patriarchate was altogether canonically indefensible. Behind it, however, lay the national question as to whether Thrace and Macedonia were to be Greek or Bulgarian, *Piu se muove*. In the seventies, the Bulgarian Nation was regarded by the Panslavist as his puppet and the Russian Tsar used it as the instrument of his advance on Constantinople. Much water has ebbed and flowed in the Black Sea since then. Panslavism is now forgotten. The Balkan question has been regulated, if not solved finally. And there is no reason whatever why the Bulgarian Exarchate of Constantinople should not cease to exist and the schism be healed—except that the Œcumenical Patriarchate not unnaturally requires the Bulgarian Church to express penitence for its intrusion and that the politicians do not desire its healing.

The unwillingness of the Œcumenical Patriarchate to invite the Metropolitan Antony of Kiev to nominate a delegate on the Commission rests on grounds which are more complicated and which it is not within the province of Anglicans to discuss. But it would be quite unfair that we should suppress the fact that the authorities of the Serbian Church dismiss those grounds as having no validity and recognize the Metropolitan Antony as being the canonical president of the Russian Church in Exile.

In spite of the absence of Russian and Bulgarian delegates, the Orthodox personnel of the Commission cannot be regarded as other than adequately representative of the whole Orthodox Church.

Since the widowhood of the Jerusalem Patriarchate kept Archbishop Timotheos of the Jordan in Palestine, and Archbishop Nicolas of Ermopolis in Egypt, the Archbishop of Thyatira represented the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, as well as the Œcumenical Patriarchate and that excellent theologian, the Great Archimandrite Michael Constantinides who as Dean of St. Sophia, Bayswater, is well known, and a *persona gratissima*, to Anglicans, represented that of Alexandria. Otherwise, all the nominated members of the Commission, Anglican and Orthodox, were present. Of the Orthodox, Archbishop Nectarie of Bessarabia, Bishop Irenäy of Novi-Sad and the Metropolitan Leontios of Paphos were

members of the 1930 Delegation. The Russian Professor Arseniev who was the delegate of the Polish Orthodox Church, is a very frequent visitor to England. The delegates of the Churches of Antioch and Greece, the Metropolitan Theodosios of Tyre and Sidon and Bishop Polycarp of Trikkala and Stagon, were alone newcomers.

All the Anglican members were present throughout every sitting of the Commission, viz: the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Headlam), who is its Anglican Chairman, the Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Gregg), the Bishops of Gibraltar, Fulham and North Indiana (Drs. Hicks, Batty and Campbell Gray), Professors Goudge and Grenstead, Canon J. A. Douglas and the Secretary, the Rev. P. Usher. Dr. Gray had travelled from America for the session. Mr. W. V. R. Brade and Canon Wigram acted as German and Greek interpreters.

All the Orthodox delegates and those Anglican members of the Commission who do not live in London were the guests of the Archbishop of Canterbury in Lambeth Palace, his Grace's Principal Chaplain, the Rev. A. C. Don, who was specially charged with the arrangements, devoting himself unsparingly to their entertainment.

The purpose of the Orthodox delegates' visit being practical, no ceremonial programme was arranged for them such as marked the visit of the Orthodox Delegation last year and except Bishop Irenäy who visited Edinburgh and Glasgow on a short preaching tour, none of them accepted any public engagements during his stay in England.

As has been his wont whenever distinguished Orthodox hierarchs visit London, Mr. Athelstan Riley entertained the whole Commission to dinner, the Greek Minister and the *chargés d'affaire* of the Roumanian and Yugo-Slav Legations being among his other guests. The Bishop of London also invited the Commission to tea at Fulham on Sunday, October 18th, in the evening of which day, Bishop Irenäy, who preached its Patronal Festival Sermon, was accompanied to St. Luke's Church, Camberwell, by several of the Orthodox Delegates, who desired to visit it on account of the *eikons* in its Chapel of Unity.

At the time when these notes were written, the Report of the Session of the Commission was in the Press[1] but no statement as to its results had been published.

[1] It was published on December 23,

It will not be indiscreet, however, to say that the Commission devoted its time exclusively to the work for which the Orthodox Delegation to the Lambeth Conference agreed that it should be set up, namely, the investigation of the dogmatic agreements and disagreements between the two churches.

If it is to be thorough, that investigation must necessarily cover a very wide field and will require many sessions of the Commission.

A reference to the Minutes of the Discussions at Lambeth last year which were first published in this year's Spring *Christian East* will show that in particular the business of the Commission is to make the *Terms of Intercommunion*, published by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Eastern Churches Commission in 1921, as a *ballon d'essai* "in order to provoke discussion," the guiding line of its investigation; and it was for that reason that they were reprinted in our last issue.

As a matter of fact, the subjects dealt with in the first eleven of those Terms received preliminary consideration during the Commission's session.

To the journalist on the swoop for a scoop or to the general public which is interested only in the bringing rabbits out of a hat, the results of the session will probably appear very small.

Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus!

No one can be surprised, if when the Report of the Session appears, it is ignored or greeted with a jeer of the kind. The same public attention which was focussed upon the Orthodox Delegation last year, has been intrigued by the session of the Commission. It has been useless for those of us who understand the essential position—and anyone of average common sense who takes the trouble, can understand it at a glance—to say that since full and dogmatic agreement is the indispensable preliminary for the establishment of formal Intercommunion between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches, there was no possibility that the Report of the Commission would recommend it.

Our extreme Evangelicals have been like bolting horses. Their periodicals such as the Record have sniffed an Anglo-Catholic plot to declare the Union of the two Churches and thereby both to deny most things which Evangelicals cherish and to commit the Church of England to most things which they denounce.

How the idea that a declaration of the Union of the two churches is imminent ever got into anyone's head, beats our understanding. Perhaps it did so because the Œcumenical Patriarch has declared that their relations have passed out of the friendly stage and into

that of brotherliness and intimacy. No doubt, the mere setting up of the Commission, following upon the doctrinal agreements in regard to the Sacred Ministry, and the Eucharist reached by the Orthodox Delegation and the Anglican Bishops during the Lambeth Conference and the Delegation's provisional authorization of Economic Intercommunion overseas, have contributed to that notion. Again, at its very first session—at Bonn, from July 2-4 last—the parallel Old Catholic-Anglican Conjoint Doctrinal Commission had recommended an immediate declaration that the Old Catholic and Anglican Churches are in full agreement on all essential doctrines and the establishment forthwith of the fullest Intercommunion between them. The deduction appears to have been drawn that the Anglican-Orthodox Conjoint Committee could do no less.

At any rate, more than one London journal published articles from their special correspondents professing to reveal the secrets of the Commission and announcing with leaded captions that full Intercommunion had been agreed.

None the less, the result of the Conjoint Commission's first session constitutes a very remarkable step forward and one which few of us anticipated would be achieved at so early a stage in the investigation. To ascertain whether a dogmatic agreement existed between the Old Catholic and Anglican Churches was easy. Both being Western and akin in tradition and ideology, the formularies of the one are easily intelligible to the other. To ascertain whether such agreement exists between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches is vastly more difficult. Even in patristic times, the Greek categories of Eastern theological thought moved in a different plane from the Latin categories of Western theological thought and in some matters the Eastern dogmatic position was contrasted with the Western. For the past nine hundred years Eastern and Western Christendom have lived and developed in remote worlds. Moreover, it is by no means the case that the Latin-derived English theological terms which our dictionaries give us as equivalents for traditional Greek theological terms are really equivalent to them. And so on.

Accordingly, the investigation before the Commission requires thorough and careful exploration in order that the real dogmatic position of the two Churches on any matter may be mutually understood.

Owing alike to our domestic conflicts and to our controversies with Rome and with Geneva, we Anglicans are inclined to focus our attention in Reunion discussions peculiarly upon agreement or

disagreement as to the doctrine of the Sacred Ministry and its Apostolic Succession and upon that of the Sacraments in general and the Eucharist in particular. That the Orthodox are watchful in regard to those matters should need no demonstration. But their watchfulness in regard to them is secondary to their watchfulness upon matters, the decisions upon which they regard, and rightly regard, as primary not only because the decision upon the secondary doctrines of the Sacred Ministry and the Sacraments depends upon them but because they provide the criteria for the right conception of the Church.

The term Tradition—*paradosis*—is applied both to the handing down of belief or customs and to those beliefs or customs themselves. In the former case it is used among the Orthodox in an ordinary and wider sense to include human tradition, sc. the handing down of beliefs and customs which are not integral to the Divine Revelation but which may be received or rejected as matters of pious opinion or of which, though, in themselves, they are not of divine revelation or institution, the principles of obedience to divinely constituted ecclesiastical authority and of conformity to the general mind and life of the Church, forbid the rejection.

At the same time, however, it is used in a more restricted and specific sense, sc. for the handing down in the Church by the operation of the Lifegiving Holy Spirit of the Divine Revelation made once and for all, by and in our Lord Jesus Christ, i.e., in other words, for that conscious knowledge of the facts of the Christian Faith which was imparted at the beginning and is sustained and made known from age to age in the Church by the Holy Spirit.

Of course, the Orthodox members of the Commission were concerned with Tradition only in this more restricted and specific sense. What they required to know was whether the Anglican Communion holds that the facts of the Christian Faith are made plain, individually and independently, to every man by his personal and unaided searching of Holy Scripture or whether it holds that he needs to be guided into them by the Living Voice of Tradition. Put briefly, their question was not whether those facts are to be found in or to be proved by Holy Scripture, but whether they are made known by that Tradition of the Living Voice of the Spirit, which is expressed in the consensus of the writings of the Fathers, is set forth in the precisions of the Œcumenical Councils and is sustained in the belief of the Church through the ages.

In other words, does Holy Scripture stand alone as our source of the Christian Revelation or has Tradition of the Living Voice to complete it?

In effect, for the Orthodox the possibility of going on with the discussions hinged upon the answer to that question. If the Anglican Communion dismisses Tradition as a source of the Christian Revelation, then they must adjudge the Protestantism of Canterbury to be essentially of *pari materia* with that Protestantism of Geneva which claimed to reconstruct the Christian Faith entirely from the Scriptures. But if the Anglican Communion accepts it as a source of the Christian Revelation, then the Protestantism of Canterbury is essentially of *pari materia* with Eastern Orthodoxy in that while it protests against the claims and innovations of Rome and rejects mediæval superstitions, it desires to accept the Christian Faith, without "alteration, addition or diminution," as it has been handed down through the ages by the Living Voice in the Church.

When the Report is published, it will be seen that though the Orthodox and Anglican sides of the Commission were in fundamental agreement upon Tradition, they found it hard to express their agreement in a *formula*. On the one hand, the Anglicans, who from first to last were unanimous among themselves, could not leave open the possibility, in the words of the Archbishop of Dublin, of there being "any hidden stores of tradition," and were stout to express belief both in "the sufficiency of Holy Scripture" and the inseparability of Tradition therefrom. The language they used was derived from the Thirty-nine Articles.

On the other hand, while the Orthodox agreed that Tradition and Holy Scripture are inseparable from each other, they were not prepared to leave the door open to the Faith as they have received it, being challenged as not to be proved by Holy Scripture.

An ambiguous formula of agreement would have been worse than useless.

In the end by patient and prolonged effort to understand each other, a *formula* emerged and is recorded, which involved no compromise on either side and which expresses real agreement. That formula will be preceded in the Report by the drafts in which the Anglicans and the Orthodox began by expressing their particular positions.

As we have indicated, the Anglican draft stresses the Sufficiency

of Holy Scripture and the Orthodox draft stresses the necessity of the Completion of Holy Scripture by the interpreting, living voice of Tradition.

We cannot conceive any of our Evangelicals, except those who are determined at all costs to be sectional, refusing to be satisfied with the Anglican *formula* or any Orthodox, except those who are in blinkers refusing to be satisfied with the Orthodox *formula*. Nor can we imagine anyone regarding the final conjoint *formula* as other than plainly, consistently and adequately summarizing both *formulæ*[1].

As has been remarked above, it will be surprising if the Ecclesiastical Correspondents of our dailies do not purse their lips over the Report and say "There is nothing to make a song about here. Tradition? What is it? The British Public is not interested in abstract theological questions. Why could not the Commission give us something concrete and big?" On the other hand, it will be even more surprising if those who understand the matter do not regard the Commission's reasoned conclusion that the Anglican and Orthodox Communions are essentially in agreement as to the Sources of the Christian Revelation and the Relationship of Holy Scripture and Tradition, as transforming the whole position.

To minimise the importance of that conclusion, it clears the air by demonstrating that the dogmatic position of both Communions is governed by the same principle.

Certainly, it remains for the Commission to investigate as to whether they are in agreement as to the organs, by which Tradition declares and sustains the One, Catholic Faith, and as to the contents of that Faith. But even if—and we are confident that it will not be so—the future sessions of the Commission reveal disagreements on those matters, the importance of its finding in regard to the matters which it had to consider will not be diminished; for they have made evident, once and for all, that the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches are congenital and organically akin. If—and we are sure that in the fullness of time they will—they find themselves in the end, unable to affirm that they are in complete dogmatic agreement; at least they must recognize that their dogmatic teaching starts from common premises and claims to be governed by identical principles.

[1] Before these notes were printed, an attempt at the impossible was made by the *Record*, which, in a leading article, actually stated that the Anglican members of the Commission agreed that "Holy Scripture is *supplemented* by tradition"—which is exactly what they did *not* agree and what the Orthodox did *not* ask them to agree!

It is very possible that the Man of Fleet Street will interest himself in the exchange of Anglican and Orthodox views recorded in the Report as to the Nature and Number of the Sacraments or as to the *Filioque* Clause, rather than in the agreement arrived at in regard to Tradition and Holy Scripture. If so, he will illustrate his persistent incompetence to estimate real values and to put first things first. None the less, that exchange of views will demonstrate that even if—and we doubt it—the Commission has to record certain disagreements in the dogmatic teaching of the two Churches on those matters, the primary agreement which has been established between them, will govern and facilitate the reconciliation of their secondary disagreements.

Further, even if the result of the first session of the Conjoint Commission has not in itself been of the maximal importance which we are bold to attribute to it, at least it cannot fail to dissipate that impression that the Anglican and Orthodox Communions are being rushed into Union and Intercommunion, which has stampeded some of our Anglican Evangelicals into unreasoning hostility towards the work done at Lambeth in 1930, and which has produced cautionary, and indeed inimical, expressions of opinion in regard to the possibility of the Union of the two churches, from some Orthodox theologians, and especially from the Metropolitan of Leontopolis and those distinguished lay Professors of Theology of Athens, Drs. Balanos, Bratsiotes and Dyovouniotes.

The fact is that both in England and abroad there has been much misunderstanding as to what was achieved by the discussions of the Orthodox Delegation of 1930, with the sub-Committee of the Lambeth Conference, which conferred with it.

As the minutes of those discussions[1] show, the question of Union and of full and formal Intercommunion between the Orthodox and Anglican Communions was not then touched upon.

By the express wish of the Patriarch of Roumania the Orthodox Delegations asked certain questions touching the Anglican doctrines of the Sacred Ministry and the Eucharist, explicit answers to which have been predicated by Orthodox theologians for many years as requisite for the acceptance of our Orders and Eucharist by Economy. The answers given by the sub-committee of Anglican bishops were received unanimously as adequate by the Delegation.

[1] Printed in the Summer *Christian East*, 1931.

On their side the Anglican Bishops drew the attention of the Orthodox Delegation to the existing situation in America and elsewhere overseas whereby Orthodox who are practically in permanent and complete isolation from Orthodox clergy resort to Anglican sacramental ministrations, and asked whether that resort was authorized.

In view of the satisfactory answers to their questions, the Delegation answered that it could, and did authorize that resort as a measure of Economy provisionally and pending a decision of the forthcoming Pro-Synod of the whole Orthodox Church.

The acceptance of Anglican Orders and the establishment of *Economic Intercommunion*, i.e., the authorization of the resort of the Orthodox to Anglican sacramental ministrations where very special conditions obtain, are one thing. The Union and Intercommunion of the two Churches are another. For the former—as Canon Douglas makes very plain in a note on the Principle of Economy and its Exercise among the Orthodox in the January number of *Theology*—the Orthodox requirement is no more than that the Anglican doctrine of the Sacred Ministry, the Eucharist and the other Sacraments, should approximate to the Orthodox doctrine. For the latter, full and complete dogmatic agreement between the two Churches is the indispensable preliminary.

It was precisely in order to ascertain whether, whatever apparent disagreements it may underlie, that agreement is there, that the erection of the Conjoint Commission was decided upon at Lambeth in 1930.

That opinion in some of the Orthodox autokephalous Churches should be sensitive to, and indeed should be afraid of, the possibility that the Orthodox Church may wake up to find itself committed to Union or Intercommunion without full dogmatic agreement, is natural and easily understandable.

The sooner that suspicion is realised to be wholly groundless the better.

In regard to our Orders and to Economic Intercommunion, the questions which the Orthodox Delegation put officially to the Lambeth Conference of 1930 were answered officially. The Delegation declared itself satisfied with the answers given them. None of the Orthodox autokephalous Churches has expressed itself dissatisfied with those answers.

Certainly, the Orthodox Delegation to the Lambeth Conference was not plenipotentiary.

None the less, it was the official mouthpiece of the Orthodox autokephalous Churches which are to be represented in the Pro-Synod. As such it put the questions to the Lambeth Conference

which the Roumanian Patriarch held necessary to settle the question of Anglican Orders from the Orthodox viewpoint. It declared the answers given to those questions to be satisfactory. It asked for and it received their endorsement as "sufficient" from the Lambeth Conference. The particular canonical authorities of each of the Orthodox autokephalous Churches represented in the Delegation received the reports of their Delegates. No intimation has been given that any of those authorities consider the questions put as needing supplementation or that the answers given are inadequate.

Factually, it remains open for any one of them to instruct its delegates in the Pro-Synod to re-open the matter and it would be better that it should be re-opened than that an implementation of the Lambeth agreements of 1930 by the Pro-Synod should be half-hearted or hesitating.

But its re-opening after a lapse of two years, under all the circumstances would be surprising and would necessarily make future discussions between the two Churches very difficult.

To put the position in a nutshell.

The Orthodox Church is in a sense committed to the acceptance of Anglican Orders and to overseas Economic Intercommunion.

But so far is it from being committed to Union or Intercommunion that many sessions of the Conjoint Commission will almost certainly be necessary and several years may well elapse before its comparison of the dogmatic positions of the two churches can be completed.

The compelling desiderata for the conduct of that comparison are on the one hand that our Evangelicals should be brought to realise that they have been tilting at windmills, and on the other hand that the general public in Orthodox countries should grasp the fact that there is no possibility of their being confronted with an *Unia haud vera,* based as was the figment of the Council of Ferrara—Florence, 1438-9, on ambiguity and compromise.

If at long last the labours of the Conjoint Commission demonstrate that, as we are confident it will demonstrate, in spite of superficial disagreement, full and complete dogmatic agreement exists between the Anglican Communion as a whole and the Orthodox Communion, every stage—and there will be many stages—in those labours will be published to the world. The Anglican Evangelical and the intransigeant Orthodox, therefore, will have abundant and leisurely opportunity to utter any *non possumus* made necessary at each stage and so to cause reconsideration and to veto further progress unless and until their hesitations have been safeguarded.

In other words, we take courage to plead that alike in England and in the Orthodox World, the Conjoint Commission should be given the chance of doing its work without the distraction of a crossfire of groundless suspicion.

If its personnel is not credited with common, chivalrous honesty and loyalty, at least common sense ought to be attributed to it.

We have dwelt so lengthily upon the fact that the Conjoint Commission is engaged not upon an ecclesiastical negotiation but upon an academic theological investigation, because the decision of the Pro-Synod upon Anglican Orders and upon overseas Economic Intercommunion cannot fail to be critical for the future relations of the two Churches in particular and for the worldwide Reunion Movement in general.

If the Pro-Synod implements the agreements reached by the Lambeth Conference with the Orthodox Delegates which visited it, then the *imponderabilia* point to a rally of non-Papalist Christianity to Orthodox principles.

If it fails to do so, then, of a surety the growing solidarity between the two Churches will be weakened and dwindle. The hope of their Union will recede into the far distance and Western Christianity will tend to be divided into sharply contrasted Papalist and Protestant *blocs*.

Fiat Justitia, ruat coelum.

On the other hand, if the Pro-Synod *cannot* implement the Lambeth Agreements of 1930 without treachery to Orthodox principles, it is far better that it should refuse to do so.

A few words will be timely and useful as to the Orthodox Pro-Synod the assembly of which is now definitely fixed for Whit-Sunday June 19th, 1932, at the famous Monastery of Vatopedion in Mount Athos.

In the first years after the War when everything seemed possible, the project of convening a General Council of the totality of the Episcopate of all the Orthodox Churches, was much in the air. That there was need for such a Council was indisputable. Since the last of the Seven Œcumenical Councils met at Nikaea in 787 A.D., no Council has been held which the Orthodox Church recognizes as possessing Œcumenical Authority, i.e., the dogmatic precisions and canons of which it holds as *eo ipso* binding its members absolutely.

The so-called Councils of Lyons, 1291 and Ferrara—Florence, 1438-9, in the assembling of which the Orthodox took part with the Papacy, are rejected as devoid of authority by the Orthodox. In mediæval times more than one Council was held such as those

of Constantinople in 1261 and 1481, but they were not held to have been of Œcumenical authority in the Orthodox Church. Again in the Seventeenth Century, several topical Councils were held, e.g., those of Jassy in 1642 and Jerusalem in 1672. But since they were representative neither of the totality of the Orthodox Episcopate nor of the whole Orthodox Church, their decisions have only relative authority.

During the 18th and 19th centuries, the political situation in the Near East put the convening of an Œcumenical Council out of the question, and, indeed, consultation and concerted action between the Orthodox autokephalous Churches became almost impossible. The Russian Tsardom was pressing towards its Hope and Calling—the ejection of the Turks from Constantinople and from the ancient Homelands of Christianity, and the enthronement of its Tsar in a redeemed St. Sophia as Viceregerent of a restored Eastern Christendom and as custodian of the Holy Places. With the Great Idea menacing their Empire and Islam, the Ottoman Sultan-Khalifs were inevitably and peculiarly suspicious of solidarity between their Greek and Slav *rayah* and the Orthodox of Russia. However great were the mutual rivalries and hostilities of the Western Powers, Western diplomacy was at one in dreading the Russian Tsar's advance towards Constantinople and was united to obviate anything which might strengthen his claim to be the Protector of the Orthodox of the Balkans. For their part, the Greeks, whose Great Idea as to the disposition of the inheritance of the Sick Man of Europe was very different all along to that of the Panslavist, had no will to expose themselves to being dominated ecclesiastically by the then aggressive and predominant Russian Churchate. Moreover, when after achieving their liberty, the Roumanian, Serbian and Bulgarian nations discovered that Panslavism expected them to surrender their individuality and to merge into the Russian Orthodox Tsardom, they also became on their defence against the danger of being turned ecclesiastically into an appanage of Russian Orthodoxy.

In fact, viewed from the ecclesiastical angle, the Near Eastern drama of the 19th century is characterized not only by the heroic struggle of Tsarist Russia to liberate Eastern Christendom from serfdom to Islam but by the stubborn resistance of the non Russian Orthodox peoples to the Panslavists' ceaseless efforts to make their national churches the instrument of their russification.

It was thus that—though all the time it was there—in the century before the Great War, the principle of the concerted Œcumenical action of all the Orthodox autokephalous Churches seemed to be in

abeyance. But it is thus also that if evidence of the truly supranational character of the whole Orthodox Church can be needed, it is manifested in the fact that in spite of Panslavism and of the clashes of the ideals and rivalries of the Orthodox Nationalities, the principle of Œcumenicity remained unimpaired among them.

It has become axiomatic in modern times that whenever an Orthodox nationality is constituted into an independent sovereign state, an autokephalous church is brought into being, so that that nationality shall have free and uncontrolled expression in its church life.

Accordingly, the liberation of the Balkan Christians from their Turkish helotage was followed not only by their being formed into independent sovereign states, but into autokephalous churches, the jurisdiction of which was made coterminous with the boundaries of those states.

What we have said above concerning the schism of the Bulgarian Church with the Œcumenical Patriarchate, goes far to explain the Balkan Question. For Greeks, Slavs, Roumanians, and Bulgarians are interspersed in many parts of the Balkans and especially in that debatable land of Macedonia which from its ethnic chaos has supplied the term of a *macédoine* of fruit to the culinary art.

Humanly speaking, if the Orthodox East had possessed a central coercive authority such as the Latin West possesses in the Italianate Papacy, its unity could not have resisted the strain.

But that unity held just because it was a unity the centre of which was common Faith and a common Life and not a single visible metropolis.

Orthodoxy transcends nationality in this. It neither abolishes it nor can admit the subordination of one nationality to another. It is supranational in a way that Papalism and Protestantism can never be. Even if at times the rivalries of the Orthodox nationalities have brought them into fierce, internecine secular strife, it has never entered the heads of the authorities of their national autokephalous churches that that strife should be transferred into the spiritual sphere. There have been jolts, no doubt. But through everything, Russian, Greek, Serb, Bulgarian, Roumanian, Syrian and Georgian have held fast to their supranational unity in faith and church life.

Nothing, indeed, would have been easier than for that unity to have been broken.

The Greek, the Roumanian, the Serb and the Bulgarian, passed on their emancipation from Islamic tyranny, from impossibly outworn and mediæval conditions into the *bloc* of the European world.

In their new life they were naturally tempted if not to restate their common Faith, at least to revise and reform, each for himself, their common inheritance of canon law and of œcumenical custom. So much of both had been obsolete for many centuries—and the new wine was in the bottles.

Nevertheless, one and all, they regarded the principle of Œcumenicity as being as axiomatic and as immutable as the Pillars of Heaven. No Orthodox could or would loosen the sacred sheet-anchor of Orthodoxy. If the customs and canons of the whole Orthodox Church are to be revised or reformed, that revision and that reformation are unthinkable for any Orthodox of whatever nationality, without the express concurrence of the whole Orthodox Communion.

The fifty years prior to the War were a period of expectancy. It was plain that, long though it was postponed, the demise of Turkey, that Sick Man of Europe, must come sooner or later and either the Russian Tsardom would achieve its goal or the Balkan nationalities would establish their permanent independence. Corporate action of the Orthodox autokephalous Churches must wait until then.

The moment for it seemed to have arrived when the Armistice was signed and almost at once the project of an Œcumenical Council of the totality of the Orthodox Episcopate was mooted.

Two considerations delayed its being put into execution in the first years after the War. On the one hand, the Œcumenical Patriarchate was in widowhood through the resignation of Germanos IV. and the election of his successor was held up for four years on account of the strife between the supporters of Mr. Venizelos and of King Constantine. On the other hand, the Great Russian Patriarchate was under persecution and could take no part.

In those days few imagined that the postponement could be more than temporary. That the Bolsheviks could maintain their stranglehold on the Russian nation seemed incredible. The Treaty of Sèvres had reduced the Turks to a petty Asiatic state and under it Constantinople would have been if not a Greek city, at least, something of a free city. As soon as the contending Greek factions had composed their differences a new Œcumenical Patriarch would be there to initiate the convention of the Council and, as soon as Lenin and his junta were gone from Moscow, the Russian Church would be free to take part in it.

Those expectations were altogether falsified. As the months went on, the Bolsheviks consolidated their tyranny and threw the Russian Church into chaos by their machinations. Mustapha Kemal set up the standard of Turkish Nationalism at Angora the

forces of which, being covered by French diplomacy and equipped with armaments by France and Soviet Russia, grew from small hordes into formidable armies. The dissentions among the Greeks resulted in the overthrow of Mr. Venizelos and the practical paralysis of the Greek armies. By January, 1922, when the present Patriarch of Alexandria was enthroned at the Phanar as Meletios IV., it had become clear that the possibility of an Orthodox Œcumenical Council was receding rapidly into the distant future. Nevertheless with characteristic energy his All Holiness did what he could in order that, if the situation changed for the better, no time should be wasted. Meanwhile, he invited the other Orthodox autokephalous churches to send Delegates to a "Pan-Orthodox Conference," which might recommend provisional decisions for their conjoint acceptance.

The Greek *débacle* in Asia Minor and the Smyrniote Holocaust, brought Mustapha Kemal's Armies to the Bosphorus in October, 1922. So that when the Conference met in May, 1923, Ismet Pasha, supported by French diplomacy, was actually announcing at Lausanne Kemal's intention to extirpate the Orthodox from the restored Turkey which it was agreed should include not only Constantinople but Eastern Thrace and Adrianople.

In fact, the Pan-Orthodox Conference, of 1923, was imperfectly representative of the Orthodox autokephalous churches. Nevertheless it made many important recommendations such as the permission of the second marriage of the parish clergy, action on which has not taken place, and initiated a reform of first historic importance, viz.:—the adoption of a new Calendar practically, though not theoretically, identical with the Western Calendar, which by now has been put into force in all except three of the Orthodox autokephalous churches.

The Conference, however, had hardly dissolved before the Lausanne Treaty was signed.

Lord Curzon had vetoed Ismet's announcement that the Œcumenical Patriarchate would be ejected from Constantinople and had insisted that the Greeks of that city should remain.

Meletios IV., who was peculiarly the object of Turkish hatred, of necessity withdrew to Salonika before the Allies evacuated Constantinople and abdicated in October 1923.

Guaranteed though it was by the Lausanne Treaty the position of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, as indeed of the 100,000 Greeks of Constantinople who were all that was left of its flock in the reconstituted Turkey, remained precarious for the next six years. If Mustapha Kemal could have found a pretext, he would have packed it and them off to Greece.

In such conditions, the Œcumenical Patriarch was obliged to lie very low.

All questions of an Orthodox Œcumenical Council had, of course, disappeared.

Instead of it the holding of a " Pro-Synod," began to be mooted in 1926, when it was announced that one would be held in 1929.

The Kemalist Government, however, intimated that if any bishops left Constantinople to take part in it, they would not be allowed to return, and left no doubt that if the Œcumenical Patriarchate went on with the project things would be made very unpleasant for it.

From the time of his return to power in Greece in 1929, however, Mr. Venizelos who has the extraordinary stateman's gift of making the right concessions, set himself to reach accord with the new Turkey.

In the spring of last year the situation had so much improved that without incurring more than a frown from Angora, the Œcumenical Patriarchate convened a " Diorthodox Commission " in Mount Athos in May, 1930, in which except the Bulgarian and the Russian, a delegate of each of the Orthodox autokephalous churches took part and the function of which was to prepare the agenda and make other arrangements for a Pro-Synod to be held either there or at Salonika in October, 1931.

The time was still, however, unripe, and when it was announced that the Pro-Synod's Meeting was again postponed many of us continued sceptical as to whether it would meet within a term of years.

Last summer, however—after the Smyrniote Holocaust, the butchery of tens of thousands of the Greeks of Asia Minor and the extirpation of the rest from their ancient homeland, his doing so is a supreme example of his practical wisdom—Mr. Venizelos made an historic pilgrimage to Angora, among other results of which has been the adoption of a benevolent attitude by the Turkish Government towards the Œcumenical Patriarchate.

It seems reasonably certain, therefore, that the Pro-Synod will assemble, as announced, at the Vatopedion—the greatest of the monasteries in Mount Athos—on Whitsunday, June 18th, 1932.

Of course, the impending Pan-Orthodox Pro-Synod must in no way be confused with an Orthodox Œcumenical Council. In its personnel it will consist of an equal number of delegates—probably two—from each of the Orthodox autokephalous churches. In authority it will not be plenipotentiary as would be a Council of the totality of the whole Orthodox Episcopate, and its decisions

will only be binding, if they are not rejected by one or more of the Orthodox autokephalous churches.

The Œcumenical Patriarchate's Encyclical inviting all the Orthodox autokephalous Churches—except, of course, the Bulgarian and the Russian—to send delegates and the synodical replies accepting his invitation have been published in recent issues of *Orthodoksia*.

The names of the delegates have not been announced as yet officially.

In his letter of acceptance on behalf of the Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Patriarch Meletios urged the importance of securing the presence of representatives of the Russian and Bulgarian churches.

The agenda published consist of subjects so varied as Christianity and Modern Life, the New Calendar, the Second Marriage of the Clergy and Reunion in general and the special relations of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches in particular.

So far no official invitation has been addressed for the presence of an Anglican Delegation. Indeed since little ceremony would be possible in Mt. Athos, there appears no probability of such an invitation being given. But the suggestion has been made unofficially that the second session of the Conjoint Doctrinal Commission shall be held in Mt. Athos shortly before the assembling of the Pro-Synod.

The day before the Orthodox members of the Conjoint Committee left Lambeth Palace, news was received in London of disturbances in Cyprus during which the Governorate and with it the fine art collections and library of the Governor, Sir Ronald Storrs, were destroyed by incendiary fires.

The riots were the outcrop of popular demonstrations in support of the campaign for *Enosis*, i.e., for the Union of Cyprus with Greece, the demand for which has been persistent, vocal and unanimous on the part of the people of the island—the relatively small Turkish minority alone excepted—since Great Britain occupied it in 1878.

As Canon Wigram has pointed out in the *Church Times*, the fact that the Greeks always look to their bishops to assume the role of leadership in their movements for national independence, is a legacy from the Turkish helotage under which they were allowed no leaders except their bishops. It was so that the Greek War of Independence was begun by Bishop Germanos raising the cross as a standard of revolt at Patras, and that in the same War the Sultan had the Œcumenical Patriarch Gregory hanged in his vestments on Easter Day at the door of his Cathedral, and all the bishops of Cyprus put to death.

It is indisputable that the Cypriotes owe Great Britain a debt past paying. She liberated them from Turkish oppression, gave them justice and good government, developed the resources of their island.

The Cypriotes, and with them all Greeks, acknowledge that debt unstintingly.

None the less—however foolish and ungrateful we may consider it—they have gone on telling us all along that much though they love Great Britain and grateful though they are for that which she has done for them, they would sooner be free and united to their own Nation, than be a cherished and prosperous British Crown Colony.

From 1878 to 1914 when the island was formally annexed by Great Britain, it was nominally Turkish territory in British occupation and we paid tribute for it to the Sultan. But the Union Jack had hardly been run up alongside the Star and Crescent over Nicosia, than the Archbishop of Cyprus, Sophronios, presented the newly arrived British Government with a humble petition on the part of his flock for *Enosis* with Greece. Similar petitions were handed in almost yearly up to the outbreak of the Great War when, since Lord Beaconsfield's motives for occupying the island, viz. · (1) making it a naval base to keep Russia out of Constantinople, and (2) the relieving its people from Islamic oppression, had ceased to be operative, Lord Grey of Fallodon offered it to King Constantine as a gift, if Greece would join the Allies.

That offer was not accepted, but its having been made was not forgotten by the Cypriotes who held rightly or wrongly that, unless Great Britain was untrue to her principles, she could not have proposed to transfer them to Greece like tubs of herrings as a matter of *bazarlik* but in making it, had recognized that the Union of Cyprus and Greece was a matter of justice.

In consequence, as soon as the Armistice was signed the venerable Archbishop Cyril of Cyprus came to London in order to claim that, if Great Britain was sincere in advocating the right of nationalities to self determination, she could not, and would not, hesitate to accede now that the time was fully ripe, to the petition in the first presentation of which he had taken part as a young man thirty-six years before and in the yearly reiteration of which he had never ceased to share.

We remember very well the gentle and grateful patience with which—he stayed in London very many months—Archbishop Cyril urged his case. He was always full of affection for Great Britain. His argument was that long ago in the forties when Great Britain had annexed Corcyra and the Ionian Isles, their

people declared that much though they loved her they were not Britons but Greeks and willed to work out their destiny in unity with the rest of the Greek Nation. Queen Victoria sent Mr. Gladstone to examine their business. That great British statesman saw things as they were, and true to the great tradition of Liberty in which he lived, judged that Great Britain would win a nobler victory by hauling down her flag in those islands. The case for freedom of self determination of Cyprus was on all fours with that of the Ionian Islands. He had no doubt but that if only the British people enquired into the facts, the passionate desire of the Cypriotes would be satisfied without hesitation.

'Archbishop Cyril's argument was not met with a direct negative. He was told that the Union of Cyprus and Greece could not be considered because France vetoed it, because Italy which had seized Rhodes and the other islands of the Dodocannese which, like Cyprus in tradition and population, are historically and practically altogether Greek, would create a quarrel with Greece and would occupy the island, because Mustapha Kemal would never tolerate such an addition to the Greek State, and so on.

We remember also, how resignedly, if obstinately, Archbishop Cyril at last left England. Against Great Britain he had not a word to say. Only, he was stubborn to contend that, if the British people would only examine the Cypriote case, it would grant the Cypriote demand for *Enosis*. Meanwhile, he could not accept its negation. He and his would be patient and would not be ungrateful but they would press in season and out of season for the satisfaction of their heart's desire.

While it is doubtless true that French diplomacy is still hostile to the realization of Greek Unity and that Italian diplomacy is desirous that the Italian tyranny in Rhodes and the Dodocannese should be provided with the apologetic offset of a comparable British dominion in Cyprus, it is also true both that those Powers would not sacrifice a *piou piou* or a *fascisti* in order to stop Cyprus realizing its nationality and that, since Mr. Venizelos visited Angora, Mustapha Kemal and his new Turkey have prepared themselves probably to welcome and certainly not to be hostile to the possibility of that event.

In consequence, the only *non possumus* with which Great Britain can reject the Cypriote plea for *Enosis* with Greece, is that because she has need of the ports or plains of the island as a maritime or as an air base, she cannot part with it and that because one seventh of the Cypriotes are Moslems—and for the most part Turkish Moslems—she dare not trust them to the tender mercies of their Greek and Orthodox compatriots.

In regard to the first of those contentions, the Cypriotes themselves, and with them Mr. Venizelos on behalf of the rest of the Greek nation, have announced that they recognise that, if Great Britain requires such bases in Cyprus, she ought to retain them and that, therefore, they are very ready, so long as she allows the *Enosis* of Cyprus and Greece, that she should keep her flag flying over any harbour or aerodrome of which she has need.

But the second contention does not appear to bear even momentary examination. Admittedly, if Greeks exist anywhere, six sevenths of the Cypriotes are Greeks, consciously, ethnically, traditionally and patriotically. Moreover, as witness the declarations of the Moslem Turkish minority of Greek Macedonia that it is happy and prosperous under the benignant and tolerant Greek Republic and its urgent plea that it should not be told to emigrate into the Turkey of Mustapha Kemal, the suggestion that the Moslem Turkish minority of Cyprus would be oppressed after the island's *Enosis* with Greece would be preposterous in any case. But it passes understanding that that suggestion should be made by Great Britain at the very moment when in the face of the passionate and desperate protests of Mar Shimun and the national leaders of the Assyrian and other Christian minorities of the Mosul *vilayet*, she is assuring the League of Nations that the fanatic Moslem Iraqi Arabs who avow their grudge against those minorities, may be trusted to behave kindly and justly towards them.

As soon as he heard of the disturbances in Cyprus, Mgr. Leontios lost no time in protesting to our Archbishop and to his colleagues, Anglican and Orthodox, of the Conjoint Commission that while he did not, and could not, wish to conceal the fact that as a Cypriote Bishop he encouraged his people to press for *Enosis* with the rest of the Greek Nation and, accordingly, was constrained to do everything rightful to force that issue upon the attention of the British Nation, nevertheless, he was fully aware of the debt which the Cypriotes owe to Great Britain and also was altogether opposed to acts of violence such as the telegrams which had reached London, described as having culminated in the burning of the Cypriote Governate.

He added that it was his purpose to return to Cyprus as quickly as possible in order to restrain his flock from any further criminal folly of the kind.

On reaching Cyprus, however, he was presented with an order of the Governor forbidding him to land and was forced to proceed to Beyrouth. Thence he has passed on to Constantinople, where he is at present the guest of the Œcumenical Patriarch.[1]

[1] Since this was written he has proceeded first to Jerusalem and thence to Beyrut

No sooner had the first telegrams which announced the Cypriote outbreaks been published in the London Press, than a certain Col. Josiah Wedgewood, who sits as a Socialist M.P. for Newcastle-under-Lyme, and who has frequently sought notoriety as an anti-Christian and Turkophil in the past ten years, rushed into publicity with a letter which *The Times* actually printed and in which, assuming that the Metropolitans of Kyrenæa and Kition had had an actual hand in the violence of the outbreaks and of the burning of Sir Ronald Storrs' artistic and literary collections in the Governorate, he demanded very impudently that the revenues of the Cypriote Church should be impounded to provide an indemnity and suggested that the way to convert the Cypriote Bishops was to translate them to Rhodes and let them experience Italian Fascist methods of suppressing the nationalism of minorities.

Individually, no one could bother his head about Col. Josiah Wedgewood and his opinions. That gallant soldier is representative, however, of the type of mind which in Jingo days bolstered up the Red Sultan and which in 1922 became delirious with delight at the sack and burning of Christian Smyrna. Collectively the Col. Wedgewoods are not negligible, and given a good excuse such as the recent Cypriote outbreaks, are still capable of stampeding British opinion.

The Bishops of Kyrenæa and Kition, who were deported from Cyprus by order of the Government on the morrow of the outbreaks, proceeded via Gibraltar and Paris to London where they are now. They avow that they acted as leaders in the agitation which culminated in the recent outbreaks and, indeed, that they took part in the meetings which ended in the burning of the Governorate and other rioting. But they protest indignantly not only that they had no part in those acts of violence but that they used their utmost endeavour to restrain their people from any and every breach of the law. Indeed, they demand judicial enquiry into the grounds of their deportation and demand the investigation of that conduct.

The tradition of British Government and of British justice points to the appointment of a Royal Commission to examine the recent Cypriote outbreaks and their causes and we cannot doubt but that in due time such a Commission will be appointed.

Meanwhile, we advise our readers to discount the highly coloured telegrams and obviously biased articles which have appeared in the British Press. For our own part, we shall continue to believe that the Bishops of Kyrenæa and Kition set their faces against violence until it is proved that they countenanced it.

On the other hand, we venture to be sure that when the facts become known, it will be evident that together with the other

leaders of the Cypriote agitation for *Enosis* with Greece, the Cypriote bishops cannot escape responsibility for sowing the wind of which the recent riots in the island have been the whirlwind.

Granted that the appeal for that *Enosis* has validity and, if understood by the British Nation, would be allowed by it, the Cypriotes had their choice. They could have continued to make that appeal in season or out of season. Or, ceasing to make it, they could have resorted to the methods of the Sinn Feiner in Ireland or the Wafdist in Egypt and set about paralysing the British Government of their island.

It is with great regret that we are forced to the judgment that they have adopted both courses.

If it be proved by dispassionate and judicial enquiry that that judgment is just, it will be impossible to defend them.

By general consent, no more kindly, sympathetic or liberal Governor could have been appointed to Cyprus than Sir Ronald Storrs. To say nothing of his earlier record, his Governorate of Jerusalem was not only fruitful in fine achievement but was characterized by extraordinary understanding, sympathy and goodwill towards Orthodoxy. That from the day of his landing in Cyprus six years ago, full of eagerness to work for the material and intellectual betterment of its people, he was treated by them as an enemy, seems to us to have been one of those blunders which are no less criminal than foolish. The Cypriote leaders were fully aware that Great Britain could not then have ceded Cyprus to Greece without risk to the peace of the world. That even with Sir Ronald Storrs as Governor, they would abandon their appeal for *Enosis* was not to have been expected. But their business was to have recognized facts and while continuing that appeal to have worked with him. Instead, they appear to have set themselves deliberately to use the very democratic, administrative and legislative machinery with which Great Britain had equipped the island, in order to paralyse his Government. Finally, whether or not they meant it, it is ungainsayable that the recent outbreaks were the direct consequence of the inflammatory violence of their attacks upon him.

That being so, our sympathy must be with Sir Ronald Storrs and it is plain that in instructing him to suspend the constitution of the island the home authorities have taken the only proper course.

The following is a translation of an interview with the Œcumenical Patriarch of Constantinople reported in the Athenian newspaper, *Proia* of October 21st.

To a question regarding the various movements towards union, manifested in the different Churches, the Patriarch was good enough to answer as follows:

"The whole of the Christian world is animated with the desire for co-operation of all Churches for the purpose of facing more efficiently the anti-religious dogmas which are daily manifested. Already there exists a movement among Orthodox groups, with the Patriarchate at its head, which is aiming at the better and closer contact among the Orthodox Christian Churches. A Pro-Synod was held at Mt. Athos, the minutes of which have been published recently in one volume; on Pentecost of 1932 the Second pro-Synod will sit again at Mt. Athos. From the term we use you will understand that these preliminary meetings will formulate the work that is necessary for the convocation of an Œcumenical Synod later."

Question: Have you determined the items to be discussed at the Pro-Synod of next year?

"Certainly; they are seventeen in number. They treat of: the representation of the Russian Church; the education of the Orthodox clergy; the establishment of more intimate relations among the Orthodox Churches; the present situation in the Church of America; the reorganization of the monastic life and the renewal of its activity in the fields of science and philanthropy and sacred arts; and the methods of coping with false social systems. The relations of the Orthodox Church with the Heterodox Churches that are tending to establish closer relations with the Orthodox Church but which are not proselytizing will be examined. Such are the Churches of the Armenians, the Copts, the Abyssinians, the Old Catholics, the Anglicans, etc. We shall also study the relations and the means of defence against the Heterodox Churches that are proselytizing, such as the Roman Catholic Church, Uniates, Protestantism, Millenarianism, etc. In addition, the question of the codification of the sacred canons and canonical decrees will be studied that these may be submitted to the Œcumenical Synod for its approval. Another question that will interest the Pro-Synod will be Byzantine Art in all its aspects. You will understand, therefore, the importance of the work and how much we expect of it."

Question: What about the union with the Anglicans?

"Parallel with the Orthodox movement there is manifest a movement for a closer relationship between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. There are certain differences which separate us from the Anglican Church and for that reason a Council of Orthodox and Anglican prelates will sit in London this month. Independently of this, however, I can assure you that the Anglican prelates show much reverence and affection for the Orthodox Church. Thus a favourable atmosphere and certain favourable conditions for the discussion of these differences in a spirit of

fraternity have been created. The Old Catholics also show interest in the union."

Question: And the Roman Church?

"The Roman Church is a great and old Church which we honour and respect. We have never thought of denying the Archbishop of Rome his primacy of honour. We consider him the first in the order. But the Pope of Rome does not want the primacy of honour only, but the government of the Church, in fact the absolute government of it. Instead of the federal system, he wants a despotic centralization. And it is not only the claim—the Roman Church not only claims but also refuses to discuss her claims. She says: 'I have the key of truth and he that wanteth cometh.' Some time ago the Pope issued encyclical letters in which he forbade the Catholics to participate in conferences and discussions in which we take part and which tend to bring about a closer contact among the Churches. How, therefore, is the approach going to be effected?"

Question: Is it possible to conceive of an Œcumenical Synod without the participation of the Roman Catholic Church?

"This will be an Œcumenical Synod of the Orthodox Churches. We would have no objection to participate in an Œcumenical Council called by the Pope, provided, however, that the Pope should submit for discussion and ratification all that the Roman Catholic Church has accepted as dogmas since the Schism. If all the innovations that have been introduced by the Roman Church should be ratified by the Œcumenical Synod, we would accept them without reserve. Without such ratification how could we be expected to accept without any discussion all that the Roman Church seeks to impose? It is precisely for these reasons that we have no contact with her and that any discussion for union is rendered problematic."

OUR BOOKSHELF.

MASTERPIECES OF RUSSIAN PAINTING.

Text by Professor A. I. Anisimov, Sir Martin Conway, Roger Fry and Professor Igor Grabar; with Notes on Ikonography and Style from materials supplied by Y. A. Olsufiev and M. S. Lagovsky. Edited by Michael Farbman (Europa Publications, Ltd., £3 3s.).

This book is an illustrated record of the Exhibition of Russian Ikons at the Victoria and Albert Museum a year or so ago, which gave many of us the first opportunity of becoming acquainted with an art which has, perhaps, the oldest and most continuous tradition of any European country.

Russian Ikon-painting arose from the contact of the Russian with the Byzantine Court and from the introduction of Orthodox Christianity by the Princes of Kiev about 956 A.D.

The first Ikon-painters who settled at Kiev, Novgorod, Vladimir, Pskov and Moscow were Greeks. In the 12th and 13th centuries Greeks and Russians worked side by side. "The style of the Russian Ikon evolved gradually, on the base of its Byzantine heritage, by a slow reconstruction on national lines. Then, having been brought to the extreme limit of expressiveness, it began, under the influence of Western art, gradually to deteriorate," so Professor Anisimov tells us.

It was not until the end of the 14th century that an essential Russian style of Ikon-painting developed. This culminated in the work of Andrew Rublev. This artist breathed a new spirit into the ancient Byzantine forms. One of the finest examples of this artist's work, "The Old Testament Trinity," is illustrated in colour in this volume. Sir Martin Conway has seen and examined the original work in its place on the Ikonostas of the Trinity Cathedral of the Troitsa Lavra near Moscow, and it there obtained a hold on him which has never relaxed.

From this culmination of the development of style, Russian Ikon-painting slowly descended.

Many of the finest examples of Ikon-painting to be found in the Churches and Monasteries of Russia had become from time to time obscured by the incense and candle smoke. When it became necessary to clean and "brighten up" these ancient works of art, the restorer did not trouble to follow the original subject too closely, and, in consequence, Sir Martin Conway tells us: "A Blessed Virgin degenerated into a bearded prophet or vested saint!" and, "While venerating them as emblems, they allowed them to be destroyed as pictures."

A short time before the War some attempt was made to clean and free these works of art from dirt and the accumulations of centuries of over-painting. But unfortunately the restorers did not confine their attention to uncovering the original work, but supplied the missing parts.

After the Revolution, at the suggestion of Professor Igor Grabar, the National Central Restoration Workshops were set up to deal in a scientific manner with the classification and restoration of Russian Ikons. An important rule was made: works of art were to be cleaned and uncovered, but not added to or restored in any way.

The interesting discovery was made that the Ikon of "Our Lady of Vladimir," which had been brought from Constantinople to Kiev by Andrey Bogolyubsky in 1140, had been over-painted no

less than six times and, in consequence, the style of the original work had been quite unrecognizable.

Professor Igor Grabar gives an interesting description of the slow, difficult and painstaking processes of cleaning and removing the successive coats of repainting.

Sir Martin Conway tells us, "The lowest layers of repainting are often of great antiquity, and will not yield to solvents. These have to be chiselled off with a sharp knife-like implement, a process involving the greatest patience and skill. I watched a young man thus employed on a small but ancient Ikon of St. Michael. His patience and delicacy of touch were almost Chinese. Less than a square inch provided a day's work."

In the coloured illustration of the 12th century Ikon of St. Demetrius of Thessalonica from the Cathedral of the town of Dmitrov near Moscow, the different stages of over-painting can be plainly seen.

In order to understand the significance of Ikon-painting, we must remember that it was regarded not only as an artistic exercise but a religious one too, and prayer was part of the training. The Eastern Orthodox Christian's method of understanding religious truths is the inner, the spiritual, the intuitive, the way of a pure heart. The contemplation of an Ikon strengthens his belief in the actual incarnation of the Saviour, the sanctification and transfiguration of flesh and matter. The religious images of Western Christianity are in the likeness of man, they say, but an Ikon tries to express man's likeness to God, his spirituality and heavenly beauty. Mr. Roger Fry, in "Russian Ikon-painting from a Western-European point of view," remarks: "Whereas, in other countries . . . . the artist has always been a man quite peculiarly obsessed by the visual aspects of the external world, for ever searching in his experience of that for new significant combinations, the painters of Russia seem never to have turned their eyes upon that scene at all. *They were bent exclusively on the inner vision* which the contemplation of divine beings and sacred histories aroused within them. . . . . The art of artistic creation must thus have been for these Russian artists more like that which takes place in the spirit of a musical composer than in that of the Western artist . . . . Here, then, is an art which in its main characters is singularly free from all the mechanism of representation, purified like music of all but its direct appeals to the spirit."

This book is fully illustrated with twenty excellent colour plates and forty-three monochrome reproductions of Russian Ikons and Frescoes from the 11th to the 18th centuries which are fully described in an Appendix.

C.F.L. St. G.